

**Detailed Meeting Notes
Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board
Hamilton School, Multi-Purpose Room,
Novato, California
April 17, 2002**

Attendance

RAB Members Present:

Ed Keller; Thomas Macchiarella; Naomi Feger; Ray Zimny; Jim Lukasko (for Jim McAlister); Jim Ponton; Marucia Britto; Preston Cook; Tunstall Lang; Matthew McCarron Patricia Eklund; Thomas Hinman; Manuel Meir; Joan Dekelboum; Theresa McGarry.

RAB Members Absent:

Ray Seid; Richard A. Draeger; Andre Klein; Sabrina Molinari; Karol Raymer; Jack Walton; Patricia Ryan; Lance McMahan; Jim McAlister.

Others Present:

Joy Lanzaro; Hugh Ashley; Samantha Calamari, John Mani; Gino Yerta; Ali Richter; Kathryn Lynes; Debbie Bulter; Pam Shinuall; Travis Wiliamson; David Clexton; Tom Pinard; Steven Cher; Jim Davies; Harvey Abernathay; Michelle Dalrymple; Susan Barnes; Tom Roth; John Griffin; Michelle Galvin; Steven Chen.

Welcoming Remarks

Tunstall Lang welcomed the community to the April 17, 2002 meeting of the Hamilton Army Airfield Restoration Advisory Board (RAB). The meeting began at 7:10 p.m.

Navy BRAC Update — Thomas Macchiarella, DODHF Novato BEC

Quarterly Groundwater Monitoring

The Navy performed the most recent quarterly groundwater sampling in February 2002. The results are currently being compiled and the report should be available by the end of April 2002. The report will be available at the South Branch of the Novato Public Library.

Corrective Action Plan (CAP)

The CAP was finalized at the beginning of March 2002. The CAP identified biosparging as the chosen method for remediation. The Draft Remedial Design and Work Plan (the Plan), which spells out how the CAP will be implemented, was submitted to the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) in February 2002. The Navy expects comments from the Water Board on the Plan shortly.

Planning and scheduling continues for the installation of the biosparging system. The planned installation date is May/June 2002. The Water Board has already conditionally approved Task 6 of the CAP. On March 20, 2002 the Water Board issued a status letter

on many of the other tasks of the CAP (Tasks 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, and 9). The letter indicated that the Navy has submitted this information to the satisfaction of the Water Board. Task 9 (quarterly groundwater monitoring) will continue to be implemented. A letter describing the Navy's progress on Task 3 and 4 will be submitted to the Water Board shortly asking for concurrence that these tasks have been accomplished satisfactorily.

Question: What are Task 3 and 4?

Mr. Macchiarella: Task 3 is the preparation of the work plan for soil remediation, and Task 4 is the implementation of that work plan. The Navy believes that the remedial investigation, the interim site control plan, and the hydraulic lift removal report, together with the previous remediation that was completed in 1998/99, satisfies the requirements of Task 3 and 4.

Mr. Macchiarella explained the layout of the selected Biosparging system in relation to surrounding buildings such as the charter school, using graphics displayed at the meeting. The Navy believes that it will take one to one and one-half years to reach the goals established for the system. Once those goals are reached, the system will be shut down, and the second part of the remediation will begin, which involves monitored natural attenuation to test levels of the contaminants over time to confirm that indigenous microbes are breaking down the hydrocarbons. The monitoring will continue until such time as the final clean-up goal, or site closure, is achieved. The final cleanup goals are the MCLs for drinking water standards in accordance with the Water Board's Basin Plan.

Question: Will the follow-up monitoring occur quarterly?

Mr. Macchiarella: Yes, the follow-up monitoring will be quarterly. There will also be soil gas monitoring probes between the system area and receptor areas such as the charter school, to confirm that no contaminants are moving in that direction. If in fact movement towards a receptor does occur, the Navy has a contingency plan in place (a soil vapor extraction system) to address this.

Question: Which way does the groundwater move?

Mr. Macchiarella: The groundwater moves to the north.

Question: The main gas station is being up-gradient a bit; is there anything happening there?

Mr. Macchiarella: As far as remediation goes, there is nothing happening. The current effort is focused further to the north where the highest concentration is located.

Question: Is there anything left to be done at the old gas station?

Mr. Macchiarella: No. The other site had a system in place previously and that work is now complete. The remaining levels are within acceptable limits, although it's possible that the Water Board may, as part of its review of Task 3 and 4 mentioned previously, require additional work.

Question: Does the Navy have a quantitative goal to decrease the amount of the contamination?

Mr. Macchiarella: The goal is based on percentage reduction of concentrations in certain “performance” wells. Within 12-18 months, the concentration of MTBE in these wells should be reduced by 90-95%.

Mr. Jim Ponton clarified that the current 10,000 ppb would potentially be reduced to 375–500 ppb (a 90-95% reduction). Mr. Ponton also added that the proposed system is innovative in some aspects. Board approval of the system is predicated on the assumption that it will in fact work. The long-term goal from the Water Board is that the site’s groundwater reach drinking water standards (MCLs). Monitored natural attenuation will likely be used to ensure that this long-term goal is reached. Once the system reaches its point of diminishing returns, the Water Board will evaluate its effectiveness and will then discuss monitored natural attenuation.

Question: What type of system is Biosparging?

Mr. Macchiarella: It is an injection system. Biosparging is a scaled-down version of an air-sparging system, which involves injection of air to volatilize the organic compounds from their dissolved state in the groundwater so that they move into the vadose zone where they can be extracted. The biosparging system involves a lower level of injection that will not volatilize the organics from their dissolved state in the groundwater. It will augment the oxygen for the existing microbes in the groundwater, which will increase the rate of natural attenuation.

Question: So nothing will be extracted into the air in this process?

Mr. Macchiarella: Right. Unless we identify increased levels in the vapor monitoring wells, and the regulatory agencies agree that we should turn on the vapor extraction system.

Question: What will we be seeing on the ground during operation of the system?

Mr. Macchiarella: This will be a neighborhood-friendly system. All the piping will be sub-surface, and C Street will have to be shut down in order to put those pipes in place. There will be a fence for security along the west side of C Street. The noise should not be significant, since the sparging system will be enclosed in sheds.

Question: How long will C Street be closed?

Mr. Macchiarella: I should have a better idea in the next couple weeks. We think it will be three weeks at the most, and probably less than that. The Navy will of course notify the charter school and the day care center as soon as possible. The Navy is looking at early June as a timeframe for this work.

Question: The system building will be taken down after a year?

Mr. Macchiarella: Yes. There are some existing sheds that we would use, and yes they would be taken down.

Question: Will the Navy be doing air monitoring when the system is being installed?

Mr. Macchiarella: Yes, there will be safety and health monitoring during implementation of the system.

Palmisano Community Play Park Update- Jennifer Valenzia, Navy Remedial Project Manager

Ms. Valenzia reviewed the background of the investigation area and why the Navy performed this testing. The park is located at the south end of Hangar Avenue, along the west side of Hangar Avenue, near the Southgate residential complex.

This investigation was undertaken based on a personal interview that was documented in the Army Archive Search Report in which an individual had reported seeing dumping in the area in the early 1950s. He claimed that he had observed oils, paint, grease, and debris being disposed of in the area and covered with dirt. The Navy looked at aerial photos of the site spanning several decades and could not find any direct evidence of a disposal area.

The Navy also investigated a pipeline construction project area that was located in the same general vicinity. The pipeline was constructed in 1996, and it transects the entire parcel north to south, requiring an excavation 25-feet-wide and 20 feet deep. The Navy interviewed several individuals including the city inspector who was on the site daily. There was no evidence of a dump site observed during that excavation. Nevertheless, the Navy tested the site to investigate whether it is safe for its current use.

Summary of Field Investigation

DTSC had met with the individual who made the claims and also performed a site walk. The Navy selected the sampling locations based on this individual's recollections of the disposal areas, including 16 samples within the playground, three samples within the ballfield, and one sample on the other side of the pipeline excavation. The Navy drilled at 20 separate locations, collecting continuous core samples to a depth of 8-14 feet. The Navy chose one to two samples from each core for field screening. Based on the results of that analysis, five additional soil and groundwater samples were selected and sent to an analytical laboratory, where further analysis was conducted for a suite of compounds, including volatile organic compounds, semi-volatile organic compounds, total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH), and metals.

Based on visual observations, field screening techniques, and laboratory analytical results, no materials or contaminants indicative of a gross dumpsite were observed within the investigation area. No VOCs, SVOCs, or TPH were detected in the soil with the exception of one low detect of naphthalene in sample #15 and one low detect of TPH in sample #17. Both TPH and naphthalene were detected well below their respective Water Board Risk-Based Screening Levels (RBSLs) and residential Preliminary Remediation Goals (PRGs). No VOCs, SVOCs, or TPH were detected in the groundwater with the exception of one low detect of MTBE in sample #8 and one low detect of toluene in sample #12. Both MTBE and toluene were detected well below their respective Water Board RBSLs and tap-water PRGs. Low levels of metals were detected in soil and groundwater, but at concentrations that are likely a result of natural conditions in the area.

The results indicate that there is no evidence that a dumpsite exists in the area, and that the area continues to be safe for its current use.

Question: How did you determine which samples went to the offsite laboratory?

Ms. Valenzia: The samples were chosen based on a visual inspection of the sample cores, and the field test screening techniques. The samples were evaluated using a photo-ionization detector and an immunoassay field test kit for TPH.

Question: What was the MTBE level and what was the source?

Ms. Valenzia: The Navy does not know what the source could be. However, MTBE is a fairly recent contaminant that has been introduced into the environment, and the level detected was 1.9 micrograms per liter (ug/l); the Water Board screening level is 40 ug/l; and the tap water PRG for MTBE is 720 ug/l.

Question: I was involved in the construction at this site and there was a lot of storm drain pipes placed all around the ball field. Could the MTBE have come from the equipment from the excavation?

Ms. Valenzia: It could be. Because the level detected was so low and it only happened in one instance, it is considered anomalous.

Question: At what depth were the samples analyzed and did you do any analysis of surface samples in areas of new disturbance?

Ms. Valenzia: The Navy sampled between four and 14 feet below the ground surface. The Navy did not sample the ground surface because it consisted of at least two feet of fill material. The Navy only analyzed the native materials.

Question: So there are no samples at two feet?

Ms. Valenzia: We sampled perhaps two feet below the original grade, but generally, we observed about two feet of fill material above native material, which would be four feet below the current ground surface.

Question: Were these samples sent to the lab?

Ms. Valenzia: Three of the five samples were collected from four feet below the ground surface. And one of those three samples was collected within the playground itself.

Ms. Valenzia used a graphic to identify locations where samples were collected.

Question: Has this report been analyzed by other agencies?

Ms. Valenzia: Yes, both the Water Board and DTSC have reviewed it.

Mr. Jim Ponton added that he reviewed the report with Mr. Lance McMahan. The two of them had a phone conference with Ms. Valenzia and Mr. Macchiarella on Monday of this week, and they asked many of the same questions that the public is asking now. Mr. Ponton feels that the Navy did a good job laying out the sample grid and collecting

samples and analyzing them. The concentrations detected, from Mr. Ponton's perspective, do not raise red flags.

Question: How much did this testing cost?

Ms. Valenzia: The field effort and subsequent reporting cost \$45,000.

Question: Will there be any follow-up with the media about the status of this testing?

Ms. Valenzia: There is a representative from the media present tonight. I have a copy of the report available tonight. I also have copies of the aerial photos if you would like to take a look at them. The report will be available at the South Novato Public Library tomorrow.

Question: Do you believe this was ever a dumpsite?

Ms. Valenzia: No.

Question: Did the person who made the initial allegation of the dumping say anything about the size of this dump?

Ms. Valenzia: No, he did not indicate the quantity. He remembered living here as a child and remembered seeing dump trucks in the area and a ball field being constructed. He was probably five years old at the time.

Question: Where are the storm drains located in the park?

Ms. Valenzia: There is one by the sandbox and one between baseball field and the play area.

Landfill 26, GSA, and North Antenna Field - Jim Lukasko, USACE (for Jim McAlister)

Buffer Trench

The Corps is currently working with a passive ventilation design. The trench is now half completed and construction should resume in June 2002. The impermeable barrier will be installed after the trench work is completed and back-filled with gravel. The barrier, a plastic called gundwall, will be driven into the back-filled gravel, and the panels will be cut and fitted to each specific place. That process should be completed by the end of the summer. The total length of the trench will be 1600 feet and will consist of eight segments. Mr. Lukasko displayed a diagram and cross-section of the trench to explain the proposed work.

Human Health Risk Assessment for Hamilton Meadows

The Corps sent the work plan to the agencies in March 2002. The agency comments have been received and are now incorporated in the work plan. The revised work plan should be submitted to the agencies in May 2002 and the final risk assessment should be submitted in June 2002. A fact sheet for the general public will accompany this document.

Methane

Mr. Lukasko displayed a schematic of the landfill area showing location of the buffer zone, the Shea Homes development, and the gas monitoring probes. There are shallow gas monitoring probes near the development, and gas monitoring probes located in the buffer zone that extend down to the water table.

Mr. Lukasko explained that the Corps has been monitoring the gas probes monthly over the past year, and while a few of the probes have detected methane at 5%, the majority of the site has detections at or approaching zero percent methane. It normally exists right above the water table in that first few feet of saturated soil, called the capillary fringe. The Corps has not been able to identify a zone that is permeable and which could conduct methane or landfill gas from the landfill towards the development. The Corps will continue to conduct regular monitoring.

Question: I'm wondering if we just get rid of lots 22 through 32, and 156 through 174, would the problem be solved by having the roadway be the buffer zone?

Mr. Lukasko: We will suggest additional site investigations in those lots, we'll look at the radioisotope chemistry and other trends to identify where the methane is coming from. But it hasn't been determined yet whether it makes sense to do more water and soil gas samples along with excavations in these areas.

Susan Barnes (Shea Homes): To what depth are you probing?

Mr. Lukasko: Anywhere between 3-1/2 feet for the shallow probes, to 10 feet below ground level for the deeper probes. The shallow soil gas probes were used exclusively for the risk assessment. The deeper probes were used for monitoring the landfill.

Tom Roth (Congressman Woolsey's office): The one probe that recorded levels of 20, 30 and even 60 percent methane, was that detected underground, not in the air?

Mr. Lukasko: Yes, those were recorded by the gas monitoring probes, the deeper ones located above the water table.

Tom Roth: So there's no danger of ignition?

Mr. Lukasko: No, I don't believe so.

Question: Have you also been monitoring for VOCs and what are the concentrations?

Mr. Lukasko: Yes, the probes are monitored for methane as well as VOCs. We take some of those samples back to the laboratory for confirmation sampling. We were out in the field last season and collected a lot of data on this. Based on our results, VOCs should not be a concern. The Corps is currently collecting data for a technical memo to be provided to the regulators. Hopefully by the end of the year we will have a report detailing the results of this investigation. Mr. Lukasko used a site diagram to point out areas where VOCs have been detected.

Michelle Galvin (Novato resident): What type of soils are you encountering?

Mr. Lukasko: The top five feet of soil is generally fill material that has been reworked during construction activities. Below the top five feet is mostly silt, there is also some sand and bedrock depending on the area.

John Mani (Mayor of Novato): Regarding the two probes that show methane, how long have the probes been in place, and is there consistent monitoring?

Mr. Lukasko: The probes were put in place last summer by the Shea Homes developers and they have been sampled monthly since then. The data has been consistently 20-60 percent volume of methane.

Question: Are you testing any of the other test sites that are on the Shea Properties?

Mr. Lukasko used a diagram to indicate where other test sites are located. The Corps has detected low levels of VOCs across the street, which surprised them since the Corps had assumed that the VOCs would be coming from the landfill.

Steven Chandler (resident): Where is the MTBE plume in relation to this?

Mr. Lukasko used a diagram to indicate the 1 ppb contour line of the MTBE plume.

Steven Chan: It's my understanding that Shea Homes placed a number of probes (160-170) in addition to the ones that the Corps placed, because they felt that the number and location of the Corps' probes were insufficient. Can you comment on that?

Mr. Lukasko: No, I won't comment on their work. The Corps has worked closely with the regulatory agencies to develop our plan. The agencies reviewing our work include the Water Board, DTSC, and Integrated Waste Management Board

Steven Chandler: What, if anything will be done with Shea's findings?

Mr. Jim Ponton: Shea Homes has installed probes on their properties and their data is shared with the Corps and with other regulatory agencies. The Corps also shares their data with Shea Homes. They meet regularly to discuss the data, what the trends are, and how to best use the data. The historical data was used to focus the second phase of testing for the risk assessment. So everything has been used. Even once the risk assessment has been completed, the monitoring phase will continue to ensure that the levels do not increase. Regarding VOCs, where the VOCs have been detected, methane was not detected, and vice versa. The original hypothesis was that all the compounds detected were related to the landfill. My personal perspective is that the origin of the methane is the landfill, but with the VOCs being detected so far from the landfill, it's not clear that they are related to the landfill.

Theresa McGarry added that DTSC has their toxicologist looking into this right now. This VOC data has been presented pretty recently, so once we have our hands around that, we will figure out where to go from there. It's great that Shea Homes has gotten involved and is doing additional work. There has been no determination about what will be done with Shea's data and the agency data.

Our main concern is that the protocol being used is consistent with the methodology being used by the Corps. And there are experts involved on both sides, and everyone has had input, which is great. The risk assessment will be based on data collected through the end of February 2002.

Timeframes

Construction of the buffer trench will start in January 2002. It is due to be completed in June 2002.

The risk assessment is due to be completed in June 2002

Compliance with Board Order will be achieved in 2005-2008

RWQCB permit compliance will begin 2008

Monitoring of the landfill will continue throughout this time period.

Mr. Jim Ponton added that the Board adopted two orders in November 2001: a clean-up and abatement order which lists the actions to be taken to further investigate the landfill, and a time schedule order which lists penalties if the activities are not completed per schedule. The orders lay out a road map into the future for tasks that need to be implemented to address methane at the landfill and the surrounding properties on the other three sides of the landfill. The order also requires that if the landfill is the source of methane gas, that it be targeted for remediation (passive or active) so that it can't act as a source of methane gas migration. The orders were put off into the future due to funding limitations within the military, with the understanding that the buffer trench would be installed in the short term to isolate the landfill from the development and to allow the effectiveness of this action to be monitored.

Long-term Activities

The landfill and development will continue to be monitored. The Corps will comply with the RWQCB Board orders and all future regulatory requirements.

Jim Davies (Shea Homes): You mentioned that you would be doing some additional investigation work around lot 30 and 161. Could you comment on what you would be doing and when that would occur?

Mr. Lukasko: I don't have details on that at this time.

Susan Barnes (Shea Homes): You mentioned that you had readings of methane above 5 percent at lot 161. What are your current readings at this location?

Mr. Lukasko: I have data from February 2002. It still shows about 5 percent.

Susan Barnes: I wanted to clarify that Shea Homes has two data monitoring points at this location and we have consistently gotten readings below 5 percent since the trench has been installed. The levels have decreased consistently and some readings are at non-detect.

Hugh Ashley (Corps): Is there monitoring of the risers that were installed in the trench?

Mr. Lukasko: We will be monitoring them once they are all installed.

North Antenna Field

The Corps has completed a draft remedial investigation for the regulators to review. The report was submitted to the agencies in January and the Corps is waiting for comments. The Corps has also started preliminary work on the Feasibility Study.

Mr. Lukasko used a diagram to locate ten areas of investigation. The primary contaminants of concern are primarily Lead, PNAs, petroleum, dioxin/furans, PCBs, and VOCs. The schedule for completion of documentation is as follows:

Remedial Investigation	May 2002
Feasibility Study	December 2002
Risk Assessment	August 2002
OE Clearance	August 2003
Decisions Document	June 2003
Remedial Action	October 2005

Question: How will the 2005 timeframe mesh with the wetland development project and the arrival of dredge material from the Port of Oakland?

Mr. Lukasko: It should work just fine. As the issues of the BRAC properties are resolved, the planners will be ready to move on to the north antenna field site. The placement of dredge material is expected to take several years, so the BRAC property or the Bel Marin Keys property would be the first place to accept dredge material.

Army BRAC Update: Mr. Ed Keller, BRAC Environmental Coordinator (BEC) **Documentation and Field Work**

Mr. Keller introduced himself and identified the BRAC areas on the Hamilton property, along with the BRAC office located out on the airfield itself. Mr. Keller noted that the latest issue of Environmental news is now available and that the newsletter lists websites where additional information can be found.

Documentation

Main Airfield Inboard Area Site Record of Decision/ Remedial Action Plan (ROD/RAP)

The public comment period on the ROD/RAP extended from August 20 to October 18, 2001. A public meeting was held on September 4, 2001 to explain the document and to receive public comment. The Army received several comment letters on the ROD/RAP. The responses to those comments were forwarded to regulators for review in February 2002, and the Army is waiting for their comments. The Army hopes to finalize the document this summer.

The ROD/RAP document specified excavation for some of the sites, it recommended managing some of the sites in place, and also recommended no further action on some of the sites. The document is available if anyone would like to have a look.

Main Airfield and Coastal Salt Marsh Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET)

Early Transfer refers to the fact that the Army would like to transfer the property prior to completing of all of the remedial actions. The reason the Army would like to transfer the property early is to allow the wetland design process to start. The wetland project is scheduled to take six to eight years before Bay waters can be allowed to enter the site. A lot of construction work also has to be completed before the site can start to receive dredge materials from the Port of Oakland and other locations. The Army would like to transfer the property to the State Coastal Conservancy so those actions can get underway while the final remedial actions are implemented.

The public comment draft FOSET was forwarded to the regulators for review on March 1, 2002. The public review period will hopefully begin this Summer 2002, since the Army would like to transfer the property this fall, and the Coastal Conservancy would like to complete their preliminary actions in preparation for receiving dredge material starting in fall 2003.

The Environmental Baseline Survey for the Main Airfield Parcel (EBS)

The document provides a snapshot in time of what the property condition is at the time of transfer. The EBS was forwarded to the regulators for review on March 28, 2002. The Army expects to receive comments from the regulators on this document in the next month or two. The EBS will be released for public review in support of the FOSET.

Question: Is the EBS required for the FOSET?

Mr. Keller; Good Question. In California the answer is that the EBS is required not for the FOSET, but for transfer of the property.

Question: The state has criteria for the acceptance of land, a screening process that they go through.

Mr. Keller: That is not part of this process. Anything that the State Coastal Conservancy needs to do to accept the property is something they are doing on their end of things; it's not part of this documentation. The purpose of this documentation is not to fulfill a State's requirement for the acceptance of property. It is simply to document the condition of the property at the time of transfer. The FOSET demonstrates to the Army and the public that the property is suitable for transfer.

The Outparcel A-4 No Further Action Record of Decision / Remedial Action Plan (ROD/RAP)

The public comment period for the ROD/RAP extended from October 22 to November 21, 2001. A public meeting was held on November 14, 2001 to explain the document and to receive public comments. The Army received minimal comments on the document and has addressed those comments in the final document. The Army signed the document and send it to the regulatory agencies.

DTSC determined that this site is a petroleum-only site, related to an underground storage tank (UST) and a fuel line that ran through the property. The Army is now waiting for a closure letter from the RWQCB and DTSC. The RWQCB has indicated that they are close to issuing the closure letter for the UST, but they still have some issues with the fuel line. The property will be transferred once the closure letters are received. The Army hopes to transfer the property this summer.

Outparcel A-4 – Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST)

The public comment period for the FOST extended from November 1 to November 30, 2001. A public meeting was held on November 14, 2001 to explain the document and to receive public comments. The Army received minimal comments and has forwarded responses to those comments to the regulators. The document should be sent to Army headquarters for signature soon.

Hospital Hill

The regulatory closure has been received for the property. The public comment period for the FOST extended from November 1 to November 30, 2001. A public meeting was held on November 14, 2001 to explain the document and to receive public comments. The Army received minimal comments and has forwarded responses to those comments to the regulators. The Army has now signed the FOST and instructions have been sent to the Corps of Engineers to work out the deed language with the City of Novato, and the property should be transferred soon.

Question: What if the intended reuse is non-commercial? Does that change the clean-up order?

Mr. Keller: This was a petroleum-only site. We cleaned up to the 100 ppm range which is lower than the neighboring residential clean-up goals for the GSA property. The only other issue that would come out if it was to be used for residential purposes would be lead-based paint issues.

Question: What about community services?

Mr. Keller: When I say residential uses, we use the target of a six-year-old child who uses the site on a regular basis. A use such as community services would not fall under that category.

Petroleum Oil Lubricant Hill (POL Hill)

The Army agrees with the regulatory agencies that the only chemical of concern on this parcel is the remaining groundwater contamination from AST-2. The chosen method to address this compound is Monitored Natural Attenuation will be the remedy. The first of three monitoring events occurred in September 2001 and the data report was forwarded to the Water Board for review in February 2002. Only one well had detections above the GSA Residential Cleanup Goals (about 1200 ppm), which were used for the cleanup of the neighboring property.

The second monitoring event occurred in February and results are expected soon. A third monitoring event is scheduled for August 2002. A Corrective Action Plan and a Closure Report are now being prepared.

Jim Davies (Shea Homes): What are you detecting in those wells?

Mr. Keller: Diesel hydrocarbons. The one detection was identified in the center of the plume, where the UST was located. The reading was in the range of 10,000 ppm, so within one order of magnitude of the goals, which isn't too bad. The lower wells were at non-detect.

Field Work

Building 82 — This is the building out on the airfield in which the BRAC office is located. There is a concern regarding residual petroleum in the groundwater underneath the building. A workplan to address this issue has been submitted to the Army for internal review and should be completed shortly.

Removal of Asbestos Containing Material – The Army has signed an agreement with the State to remove all asbestos-containing material from the site prior to transfer. The current scope is complete, however the Army has now identified a couple items that weren't in the scope and is now looking into modifying the existing contract to include them.

Main Airfield Inboard Sites Remediation – The current effort includes the work identified in the Inboard Area Sites ROD/RAP: Building 41 demolition, Spoil Pile F and Revetments 6 & 7. Excavations at Revetment 6 & 7 were completed and confirmation samples were collected. At revetment six, the Army broke up the pad and generated a pile of concrete rubble. The clean rubble was sent for recycling. In the center of the former revetment pad the Army excavated down to approximately eight feet to remove petroleum-contaminated soils. The confirmation sampling data indicates that the actions were successful. The contaminated soils have been stockpiled for future disposition.

At revetment seven, the excavation was shallower. Contamination was expected around the edge, but there was an area in the center as well. The Army took samples from the most stained and aromatic soil, but the analysis does not indicate any contamination, other than very low levels of VOCs. That soil has been stockpiled anyway. The majority of the excavation was done at the edge of the revetment, where PNAs and lead were the contaminants of concern. Lead levels were marginally above the background and PNAs were not elevated, but the Army excavated them anyway. All of these soils were located in the pathway for the future channel for the wetland. The excavation had to be completed outside of the nesting season of the California clapper rail.

Coastal Salt Marsh Site Delineation Sampling

The Coastal Salt Marsh includes everything from the levee outward to the Bay, and all of this area is considered endangered species habitat. The purpose of this sampling was to define the extent of habitat disturbance resulting from potential future remedial actions. The sample collection is now complete, and the data will be used to support the Feasibility Study and Coastal Salt Marsh Decision Document.

The Coastal Salt Marsh Feasibility Study is now being prepared and is on schedule for regulatory review to start April 24, 2002. The decision document will be submitted for internal Army review next week, and should be out for public review this summer.

Next Steps

Inboard Property

The Army will complete the remedial actions as defined in the ROD/RAP, including disposal of the soils currently stockpiled in the revetment area. The Army will complete a FOSET for public review and will hold a public meeting on that document. The Army also plans to complete the Environmental Baseline Survey. Once all of this documentation is complete, the property can be transferred, hopefully in fall 2002.

Coastal Salt Marsh

The Army will complete sampling data report, and will prepare the Feasibility Study which includes options for remediation. The Army is also currently preparing the decision document, which will present the selected remedy. The Army hopes to have this document out to the public this summer, in preparation for taking action in the Coastal Salt Marsh in September 1 through January 31, 2003.

BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) Update - Jim Ponton

Mr. Ponton expanded on the subject of the gas station site Corrective Action Plan (CAP), which is required by the Water Board order. Mr. Ponton is very excited and stated that by the next RAB meeting the Water Board and the Navy should be turning on the switch to start the remediation system for the groundwater described earlier by Mr. Macchiarella. A lot of hard work and cooperation has happened over the past two years. The Board Order spells out what acts need to occur to protect or to restore the environment.

The Order is based on the Basin Plan, which designates the local groundwater basin and also specifies the appropriate uses for the ground and surface water within that basin, and how it should be protected. Novato is located in an area designated as a potential municipal source. Therefore, the Plan requires a high level of protection, which translates into remediation goals that stipulate maximum contamination levels and drinking water standards (MCLs).

The Board conditionally approved the Draft CAP, and the next step was to prepare a workplan that describes how the system would operate. The Navy workplan calls for plume containment stabilization and to reduce the timeframes to achieving the MCLs. The only thing the Board would like to see amended is that the workplan clearly define the MCLs as the goal.

The Board also has outstanding issues between both agencies in terms of impacts to fractured bedrock that underlies all the sediments on the site. Further evaluation will be needed.

Ms. McGarry discussed the issue of institutional controls, which involve land use prohibitions until such time as the remediation is complete. The Board is working with the Navy to implement institutional controls to prevent exposure of people using the property to hazardous substances. For instance, the Board expects that there will be a groundwater pumping restriction and a soil digging restriction, similar to what was placed on Hamilton Meadows. These will be recorded in a land use covenant that runs

with the land so that future owners would be notified of the restrictions. The covenant also gives clear authority to state agencies (Water Board and DTSC) to enforce the restrictions. The covenant is discussed in the FOST document, if anyone would like to take a look at it.

Question: Who will be the final owner of the property?

Mr. Ponton: The property will be transferred to the City of Novato. The gas station proper is planned for commercial reuse, while the balance of the property will be transferred to the City, which will then decide through their reuse plan between various educational uses.

Question: Are the institutional controls applied to the full extent of the property.

Ms. McGarry: Generally we focus in on the areas that need to be restricted. In this case, it is pretty much the entire parcel.

Mr. Ponton: It's pretty much the parcels that have not yet been transferred. The remaining parcels in the gas station area would have these restrictions.

Question: Groundwater probably won't be an issue, but soil digging might. Can you elaborate on that; how far down would the restriction apply?

Mr. Ponton: It's typical to have a restriction on these sites that requires testing prior to any future subsurface work.

Question: What about on the GSA property that has already been transferred. There is currently a restriction on fruit trees, but would that be expanded?

Ms. McGarry: That is a misunderstanding. There was a concern at one point about fruit trees, and a disclosure (not a restriction) was included in the land use covenant. The restrictions are mainly things like "Don't pump the groundwater" "No surface impoundments" "No digging below four feet"

Mr. Ponton: And the covenant is designed so that if those activities do need to occur, there is a process whereby the agencies review the request and ensure that it would comply with the law.

Question: So if Novato Sanitary or PG&E need to dig below four feet, they need to get clearance from you?

Ms. McGarry: Novato School District representatives have come to our meetings and they understand the meaning of the institutional controls and that they will be applied to the property. We have also notified local planning agencies and county agencies to make they understand the restrictions too. There are layers of institutional controls and agencies that are aware of them.

Administrative Issues - Mr. Ed Keller

Ed Keller announced that the RAB meeting location will change and that RAB members should pay attention to the next meeting agenda for details. We do not have access to this room over the summer months. The next meeting will be held on June 19, 2002. Meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.